

# The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 12, NO. 13,

Lincoln, Nebraska, April 5, 1912

Whole Number 585

## Watch Jones and Others

When astronomers find an eccentricity in the orbit of a planet they search the sky for the body that is drawing the planet out of its course. So, when you see a public man do something that can not be explained you should search for the secret cause of his unaccountable act. Senator Jones of the state of Washington entered upon his duties with the confidence of his constituents and everything went along well until after the first trial of Lorimer. Senator Jones not only voted against Lorimer but spoke against him and declared his belief in Lorimer's guilt. Then came the demand for a second investigation. The reactionary democrats joined the standpat republicans in opposing a special committee—they were shocked to think of slighting the regular committee that had made a farce of the first investigation. Finally a compromise was made. A sub-committee of the regular committee was agreed upon—the sub-committee to be composed of two republicans and two democrats who had voted for Lorimer and two republicans and two democrats who had not voted at all or had voted against him. Senator Jones was selected as a republican SUPPOSED TO BE AGAINST LORIMER BECAUSE HE HAD ALREADY VOTED AGAINST HIM. Now he turns up on the Lorimer side ON EVERY PROPOSITION. His inclination toward Lorimer became apparent soon after the second investigation began. When did he change? Is it not possible that his change came BEFORE the second committee was appointed and that he was selected BECAUSE Mr. Lorimer's friends KNEW he had changed? He may have thought that the whole question could be disposed of by a resolution declaring the first investigation a bar to any further investigation—although this question was settled when the new investigation was ordered. But this scheme did not work and he was compelled to come out into the open and join the Lorimer group on every phase of the subject.

The KNOWN facts do not explain this remarkable change—the evidence is much stronger against Mr. Lorimer than it was before. Watch Senator Jones and see if you can find an explanation of his change of front. What influence has drawn him out of his orbit?

And, while you are watching, see what senators change their votes and try to seat Lorimer by declaring that the former trial was final. Some of the men who voted against Lorimer have been re-elected and may be more free now to follow their own inclination. Some have been defeated since they voted against him and may feel still more free to vote for him now. Watch the vote—it may be interesting.

### WHICH IS DEMOCRACY?

Since Senator Hitchcock is claiming the honor of being elected a delegate-at-large on the

ground that he is a better democrat than Mr. Bryan, it is only fair that their records be compared. In the winter of 1899-1900, Mr. Hitchcock tried to secure from Governor Poynter an appointment as United States senator IN SPITE OF THE FACT THAT THE DEMOCRATS AND POPULISTS IN THE LEGISLATURE HAD SUPPORTED SENATOR ALLEN FOR RE-ELECTION. The rule of the people was not in Mr. Hitchcock's thoughts when his ambition stood in the way. Mr. Bryan's indorsement of Senator Allen aroused Mr. Hitchcock's wrath, which after a temporary outburst, was suppressed so long as an appearance of friendship was advantageous to him.

In 1904 Mr. Bryan opposed Judge Parker's nomination and was supported by a UNANIMOUS vote in the state convention. In spite of this Mr. Hitchcock threw whatever influence he had in favor of Judge Parker—the rule of the people did not weigh with him then. At this time Senator Hitchcock is seeking to prevent co-operation between the progressive democrats of Nebraska in the hope of securing NOT A MAJORITY but MERELY A PLURALITY for Governor Harmon. While he is shouting for the rule of the people he is openly working to defeat the will of the people.

The voters can decide whether Mr. Hitchcock has been, is now, or is likely to be, more loyal to democratic principles than Mr. Bryan. And a word as to Mr. Hitchcock's charge that it is undemocratic for Mr. Bryan to resign if he is elected a delegate. Mr. Bryan can not know before the delegates are elected what instructions may be given. He must therefore choose whether he will: first, refuse to run; second, run, reserving the right to resign; or, third, run and consent to obey whatever instructions a plurality may give, even though the instructions may compel him not only to do what he believes to be disastrous to the party but may compel him to help a minority of the democrats of Nebraska to defeat the will of a majority, for if Mr. Wilson and Mr. Clark divide the progressive vote equally Mr. Harmon may secure the instructions, without polling more than thirty-five per cent of the democratic vote polled.

Which is the more democratic for Mr. Bryan, to announce in advance, that he will resign and allow Mr. Harmon's interests to be protected by those who can do it conscientiously, or for Mr. Hitchcock to seek to help a Harmon minority override a progressive majority?

Mr. Bryan is following the course he has followed for twenty years with the approval of the democracy of the state. In 1894, soon after Mr. Bryan became editor of the World-Herald, Mr. Hitchcock, the proprietor of the paper, sold two columns to the republican committee to be used to oppose the gubernatorial candidate whom the paper was supporting. Mr. Bryan announced to Mr. Hitchcock his purpose to resign if the contract was not cancelled. Mr. Hitchcock did not deny the right of resignation then but cancelled the contract (but was afterwards compelled by the court to carry it out.) In 1893 a democratic state convention indorsed the unconditional repeal of the Sherman act and Mr. Bryan, a congressman then, refused to accept it as the settled policy of his party. He made a fight against it and was next year nominated for the United States senate without opposition and has been nominated for the presidency three times since.

In 1900, after being instructed for by nearly every state in the union he refused to promise to run unless the platform was one which he could honestly defend. His course in reserving the right to refuse to run was indorsed by his nomination at that time and by a subsequent nomination. Mr. Bryan is taking exactly the same position he has taken heretofore—he recognizes, and will protect, the right of the people to have what they want BUT HE RESERVES THE RIGHT, BY RESIGNING, TO REFUSE TO BE THE PEOPLE'S SPOKESMAN WHEN HE CAN NOT, WITHOUT VIOLATION OF HIS CONSCIENCE AND JUDGMENT, SAY WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT SAID—especially when under the law a minority may, by uniting, to override a divided majority.

## "Misled, Betrayed, Deserted"

"Misled, betrayed, deserted"—this will be the epitaph written on democracy's tombstone the day after the election if it allows Wall street to lead it into the nomination of Governor Harmon or any other reactionary. President Taft is the choice of Wall street—no one can get it away from him. If Wall street were authorized by the democratic convention to write the democratic platform and nominate the democratic candidates, Wall street would not support our ticket as against President Taft. Wall street has no politics: it worships money and money only. Its heart is a pocketbook. A surrender to Wall street would mean the alienation of the rank and file of the party and, after having disgraced the party, Wall street would desert it. That is what it did in 1904. Why go through that humiliating experience again? And yet some of our democratic leaders, forgetting 1904, favor Governor Harmon. Mr. Harmon's nomination and defeat would end for some time the power of the reactionaries to deceive but why postpone success. Mr. Bryan is anxious for A DEMOCRATIC VICTORY now, and he is trying to get it in the only way possible, namely by the selection of a positive, aggressive candidate on a progressive platform.

### STEPHENSON AND LORIMER

The Stephenson and Lorimer cases should not be confused. Stephenson spent an enormous sum of money (ten times as much under the new law as any senator can spend again) and it can be assumed that he spent it corruptly. It can also be assumed that he knew it at the time or accepted the results after he had reason to know how it was spent, but there was no such intimate connection between him and the corruption as there is between Senator Lorimer and the wholesale bribing of a legislature. Mr. Lorimer was on hand directing the purchase of the legislature. Lee O'Neil Browne reported to him constantly and he admits that he furnished the money to defend Browne. To seat Lorimer is to declare that nothing short of a WRITTEN CONFESSION and a RESIGNATION BASED UPON IT can get a senator out when charged with corruption. Lorimer must go or the senate reduces itself to his level.

### THE REPLY DOES NOT ANSWER

On another page will be found the reply made by Hon. E. H. Moore to Mr. Bryan's letter. If the reader will compare the two letters he will notice that Mr. Moore's letter does not answer Mr. Bryan's—it evades the main points. But it makes one important admission, namely, that when a delegate in 1904, Mr. Moore refused to vote for Mr. Harmon in the convention—NOW he is an appointee of Governor Harmon's—then he was not.

### THE ILLINOIS PRIMARY

Illinois has just adopted the presidential primary—the vote in the districts to govern district delegates. It is not known yet just how many candidates will be presented but there is one rule that should be followed in all districts, namely, vote for the progressive who is strongest in the district. Do not allow a division in the ranks of the progressives or a reactionary minority may defeat a divided majority.

### FALSE WEIGHTS

A New York butcher has been sent to the penitentiary for temporarily inserting a pound of lead in each turkey he sold. If the same law applied to speeches Mr. Roosevelt could be sent up for life for giving weight to his speeches by inserting chunks of the democratic platform.

### LIBELLING ILLINOIS DEMOCRACY

Mr. Caldwell says there will be a "Caldwell landslide" "down the state." What a libel on the democracy of Illinois! The party ought to sue him and recover damages for such an assault upon its character.

## CONTENTS

WATCH JONES AND OTHERS
"MISLED, BETRAYED, DESERTED"
WALL STREET TACTICS
AN OPEN LETTER
MR. BRYAN AND HARMON
INSTRUCTIONS
PRACTICAL TARIFF TALKS
START THE 1912 FIGHT NOW
THE MONEY TRUST
HOME DEPARTMENT
GEORGE E. DICKSON OF ILLINOIS
SAMUEL M. RALSTON OF INDIANA
NEWS OF THE WEEK
WASHINGTON NEWS